

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claim 1 is pending in this application.

Claims 3-5 have been cancelled by this amendment.

### **Objections to Claims**

Claims 1, 5 were objected for informalities.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the objections.

Claim 5 has been cancelled.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, first paragraph**

Claims 1, 3-5 were rejected for failing to comply written descriptions.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections with the following arguments.

[Argument 1]: The specification discloses, line 7 page 13 of the specifications, “routing the device”. The claim 1 claimed “positioning the device” according to the disclosure. It is well known to one skilled in the art, or even it is a common knowledge to one who is not skilled in the art, that after routing an object the object has to be positioned. By the Law of Nature, any object is positioned in the world. Applicant claimed the limitation “positioning” in its broadness without limiting how the device is positioned. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a prima facie evidence for such a rejection.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1, 3-5 were rejected for being indefinite.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejections.

Claims 3-5 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-5 were rejected under USC § 103 (a) as being anticipated by JP 2590004 in view of Jasne and further in view of Canham et al, Zier et al, Koopal et al, and Gray et al.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections with the following arguments.

[Argument 2]: The Examiner cited six (6) prior arts in combination for the rejections. It is obvious that the current invention is non-obvious in view of the combinations of six (6) prior arts. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide obviousness, motivations of combining all prior arts, and a prima facie evidence for such the rejections.

[Argument 3]: The claim 1 claimed “immersing a polypyrrole sensor into de-ionized water for ten (10) minutes to clean said polypyrrole sensor”. The cited prior arts failed to teach the specific limitation as claimed. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a prima facie evidence for such the rejections.

[Argument 4]: The prior arts JP2590004B2, US5422246 and US3929609 implement devices with a working electrode, a reference electrode, and a counter electrode that are sensors for sensing based on electric current flow and require the oxidization processes.

The current invention implements a device as a sensor based on the changes of electric voltages that is compatible with the process of semiconductor manufacturing MOSFET. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a prima facie evidence for such the rejections.

[Argument 5]: The prior art US2005/0266045 implements optical signals while the current invention implements voltage signals. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a prima facie evidence for such the rejections.

[ Argument 6]: The prior art US4919141 implements two separate working electrode and reference electrode. The current invention implements both electrodes on one substrate. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a prima facie evidence for such the rejections.

[Argument 7]: The cited prior art US4724053 discloses a technology of electropolymerized conductive polymer. The current invention discloses a pH sensing device. Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a prima facie evidence for such the rejections.

In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and requests early and favorable action on the merits. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's Attorney of Record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

6-6-2008

Date

/Ming Chow/

Ming Chow

Sinorica, LLC  
528 Fallsgrove Dr.  
Rockville, MD 20850  
301-315-5807  
206-203-2603 (FAX)